	Case 2:19-cv-	2362-TLP-tmp Document 15-12 Filed 11/13/19 Page 1 of 29 PageID 1433
	1	IN THE CRIMINAL COURT OF SHELBY COUNTY, TENNESSEE THIRTIETH JUDICIAL DISTRICT AT MEMPHIS
	2	DIVISION V
	3	ORIGINAL
	4	STATE OF TENNESSEE,
	5	VS.) CASE NO. 05-03038
	6	VERN BRASWELL,) FILED 3-1-07
	7	Defendant.) FILED WILLIAM R. KEY CLERK
	8	BY few
	9	SENTENCING HEARING January 6, 2006 Ly Criminal Count of Ly Criminal Count of
	10	by Crumal Collins
	11	appends)
	''	
and a	12	THE HONORABLE JOSEPH B. DAILEY
A. C.	13	
	14	APPEARANCES
	15	FOR THE STATE:
	16	BETSY CARNESALE Assistant District Attorney General
	17	Shelby County District Attorney General's Office 201 Poplar Avenue - Third Floor
	18	Memphis, Tennessee 38103 (901) 545-5900
	19	(901) 343-3900
		FOR THE DEFENDANT:
	20 21	JAVIER BAILEY, Esquire 100 North Main - Suite 3002
	22	Memphis, Tennessee 38103 (901) 575-8702
	23	
1	24	REPORTED BY: BETTYE A. KEE, COURT REPORTER (901) 545-5070
	25	
		MAR 0 1 2007
		Clerk of the Courts

Case 2:19-cv-0	2362-TLP-tmp Document 15-12 Filed 11/13/19 Page 2 of 29 PageID 1434	2
1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		PAGE
3	Appearances	1
4	Table of Contents	2
5	Style and Caption	3
6		
7	*	
8	STATE'S PROOF	
9	Testimony of: PEARLINE WASHBURN	
10	Direct Examination by Ms. Carnesale	11
11		
12	Closing Argument of State by Ms. Carnesale	20
13	Closing Argument of Defense	
14	by Mr. Bailey	21
15	Sentencing (24 years)	
16	Motion For New Trial (2/10/06)	28
17	Adjourned (11:45 A.M.)	28
18	Court Reporter's Certificate	29
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
>		8

1 2	IN THE CRIMINAL COURT OF SHELBY COUNTY, TENNESSEE THIRTIETH JUDICIAL DISTRICT AT MEMPHIS DIVISION V
3	
4	STATE OF TENNESSEE,)
5	VS.) CASE NO. 05-03038
6	VERN BRASWELL,)
7	Defendant.)
8	
9	This cause came on to be heard and was heard on
10	the 6th day of January, 2006, at 11:00 A.M., before the
11	Honorable Joseph B. Dailey, Judge, holding the Criminal Court
12	for Shelby County at Memphis, Tennessee.
13	The following proceedings were had, to-wit:
14	
15	* * * *
16	
17	THE COURT: Are you ready to go forward on Vern
18	Braswell?
19	MR. BAILEY: I'm ready to go forward, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Alright. Bring out Vern Braswell,
21	please.
22	(Complied.)
23	Proceed, Ms. Carnesale.
24	MS. CARNESALE: Yes, Your Honor. Mr. Braswell was
25	found guilty back in December of murder in the second degree,

which is an A felony. The State has filed a Notice of Enhancement factors. The State alleges that the defendant is within Range 1 standard offender which as Your Honor knows carries to twenty-five years.

We've also indicated that the defendant has a previous history of criminal convictions or criminal behavior in addition to those necessary to establish his range. A Pre-Sentence Report bears that out. Mr. Braswell has two prior misdemeanor convictions, one is a theft of property under \$500 from 1992, the second was an aggravated assault that he pled to misdemeanor assault from 1990. He received six months sentence with six months probation.

And we're going forward based on those two convictions. We don't have any proof other than I'd like to call Ms. Pearline Washburn. She has submitted a letter that she wrote as part of the victim impact statement, part of the sentencing report. She'd like to read that to the Court with Your Honor's permission.

MR. BAILEY: I have no problem with that. I just want to ask the Court does -- I do have some objections to the use of those convictions as enhancement factors. Would Your Honor just rather we just hold til argument or did you want to hear -- Your Honor want to hear it now?

THE COURT: I'll hear from you now.

MR. BAILEY: Alright. Your Honor, after reading

the Reform Act of 1989 and likewise after reviewing the —— for the record State vs. Edwin Gomez, which Your Honor's familiar with, but it's cited at 163 SW 3rd 632; also the Decision of State of Tennessee vs. Royce Dino Lane which is not reported in the SW 2nd Reporter, but cited as 1992 West Law 120.89; and finally the McConnell Decision that the State of Tennessee vs. McConnell —— actually it's McConnell vs. the State of Tennessee, which was a second degree murder case.

All of these I've cited with the exception of

Gomez is a second degree murder case. And this case is cited

at 12 SW 3rd 795. The Court, the Supreme Court of the State

of Tennessee and the Tennessee Criminal Court of Appeals has

now reached out through the Gomez case and adopted the

provisions, although they say it's not a new rule or principle

of law but they're simply restating a principle of law.

But they've adopted the Decision as stated by the United States Supreme Court in the Blakley Decision. And essentially it says that the factual findings -- and I'll get to the other two issues -- but the factual findings with regards to enhancements of the sentence beyond the -- a presumptive sentence which is in the middle of the range have to be done by the jury. It's as simple as that.

Now, it does give the Court discretion, but in the use of that discretion if I may just quote the Court -- it says that Your Honor is to utilize that which is in the

record, those facts which are in the record, but it also says that the requirements of the Sixth Amendment are clear, that the application of Washington sentencings which was the Blakley Decision -- violated the defendant's right to have the jury find the existence of any particular fact that the law makes essential for his punishment.

And quoting the Blakley Decision we have the Booker Decision, which is 125 Supreme Court 749. Says the Court in Booker concluded accordingly we affirm in Gomez, we affirm our holding in a prendre any fact -- and then it says "other than a prior conviction," and I'm going to come back to that.

Any fact other than a prior conviction which is necessary to support a sentence exceeding the maximum authorized by the fact established by a plea of guilty or jury verdict must be admitted by the defendant or approved by a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. And in Gomez and in the other cases -- oh, I'm sorry, in the other cases which cite Gomez, which are second degree murder cases, it sets a presumptive sentence at twenty years.

And Your Honor knows that, but for the record a presumptive sentence is twenty years. It's at the mid-point range.

Now, the Reform Act of 1989 does not contemplate the use of misdemeanor convictions. A Class A misdemeanor

which was some thirteen years ago and another Class A misdemeanor which was the assault charge which is almost -- this April will be sixteen years ago -- and nothing since then to enhance a felony conviction by a jury -- doesn't contemplate that.

In fact, I think the Sentencing Commission specifically in their comments talk about using prior convictions, a felony, to enhance.

THE COURT: Let me see what you're referring to.

Does it preclude the use of misdemeanors?

MR. BAILEY: No, it does not preclude it. I'm not stating that to the Court, but their discussion -- and I'll just pass this forward -- their discussion in the matter, you know, clearly in my opinion indicates that the Court is presuming or the Sentencing Commission presumed that -- excuse me one second, Judge, I have it here somewhere -- that the Sentencing Commission presumed the use of felonies as a enhancement factor.

A assault charge that happened, I think -- and Your Honor heard about this assault charge when we were having the bond hearing, that happened on the University of Memphis campus in 1990, in April of 1990, that -- and the theft of property, which I don't know the facts regarding the theft of property, which occurred -- which occurred in 1992 -- that's not what I'm looking for -- anyway those -- the Court -- I

don't think that the Sentencing Commission nor any court that I know of, any Decision, any major Decision that I know of has utilized or presumed the use misdemeanors over ten years old to enhance the sentence.

THE COURT: I've used them on many occasions. I don't know anything in the law that precludes the use of misdemeanors or that sets a ten year time bar.

MR. BAILEY: Well, I granted the Court -- granted
Your Honor that --

THE COURT: I'll be happy to look at such law if you point me to it but --

MR. BAILEY: I'm trying -- I had a stack of --

THE COURT: -- I'm unaware of any law.

MR. BAILEY: And, again, what I'm passing to the Court I agree with the Court.

THE COURT: Obviously a felony that occurred a year ago would carry more weight than a misdemeanor that occurred sixteen years ago, but I know of nothing in the law that precludes a Court from considering misdemeanors, even thirteen and sixteen year old misdemeanors.

MR. BAILEY: And I agree with the Court. I said I don't think it precludes it, but I think that when you read the Sentencing Commission's comments that I don't think that that's what's considered. That's my point, and I don't think that that that was the Legislative's intent behind it.

But other than that I'd also state to the Court that we, of course, we have -- we understand the Victim Impact Statement and that Ms. Washburn is here to testify so, of course, we have no comments with regard to that. I want to just also state to the Court that I've discussed with Mr. Braswell his testifying today, and he will not testify today.

THE COURT: Well, look, I assume that this line that you have underlined, the sentence that you have underlined is that to which you refer on the second page talking about prior felony convictions, but that's talking about enhancing to a different range of punishment --

MR. BAILEY: I understand.

THE COURT: -- altogether.

MR. BAILEY: I understand.

THE COURT: Not for -- not for enhancing within a range. That's two separate things.

MR. BAILEY: Alright. But I'm thinking to the Court that in order to -- in order to abridge the presumption I believe that the Sentencing Commission --

THE COURT: You're talking about two different things. If you want to move from Range 1 to Range 2 to Range 3 to career then you have to rely on appropriate felonies, of course. We all understand that.

MR. BAILEY: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And that's what this is referring to,

~

this line that you have underlined in here. But if you're talking about enhancing within a range there's nothing in the law that I'm aware of nor has there ever been that would preclude the consideration of misdemeanor convictions for that purpose.

In fact, it doesn't even have to be a conviction, it can be criminal behavior. And I don't believe the Blakley language in Gomez would have any bearing at all. It specifically culls out this prior conviction factor as one -- as a Blakley consideration at all.

MR. BAILEY: Well, I actually was using -- I went ahead and just made my full argument with regard to the Gomez and Blakley factors, not with regards to the prior convictions but just in anticipation of other factual findings that Your Honor might make in determining the sentence. I want to go ahead and go on the record on that.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BAILEY: And I would state to the Court that the recent Decision of Tate and also McConnell say that if I don't make that argument it's waived specifically.

THE COURT: Yes, sir, I understand.

MR. BAILEY: Okay.

THE COURT: Alright. Call your witness.

MS. CARNESALE: Thank Your Honor. The State would call Pearline Washburn.

```
Whereupon,
1
                            PEARLINE WASHBURN
2
    was called as a witness herein and, after first having been
3
    duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
4
                 THE COURT: Have a seat, please.
5
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
6
    BY MS. CARNESALE:
7
                 Good morning.
8
                 Good morning.
    Α
9
                 Would you please state and spell your name for the
10
    record?
11
                 Pearline Washburn, P-e-a-r-l-i-n-e,
12
    W-a-s-h-b-u-r-n
13
                 And, Ms. Washburn, you understand that we're here
14
    today for the sentencing hearing in the matter of Vern
15
    Braswell in his conviction of second degree murder, is that
16
    correct?
17
                 Yes.
18
                 You're the mother of Sheila Braswell, the victim
19
    of the murder, is that right?
20
                 Yes.
    Α
21
                 And I understand that you wrote a letter in
22
    response to the Probation Officer's request for a Victim
23
     Impact Statement. Do you have a copy of that letter with you
24
    today?
25
```

A Yes.

Q At this time would you like to read that into the Court and into the record?

A Yes.

MS. CARNESALE: Your Honor, we'd ask permission.

THE COURT: You may.

THE WITNESS: "...On Friday, November 5th, 2004, a tragedy occurred. Sheila Braswell's life was snatched from this earth, not by a stranger but by her husband. The first record of occurrence of her death Sheila was found floating in the bathtub. The second record of occurrence was Saturday, November 6th, 2004, manual strangulation.

It was very difficult to function not knowing the truth and trying to digest two days of hurt, betrayal, anger, frustration and accept death. Our family's very small in numbers but our extended family is extensive and strong in faith.

Sheila was a good wife. She shared the birth of two boys with their marriage. Numerous activities were planned around the boys. They attended family gatherings locally and out of the city. During her busy schedule she managed to clean, wash and complete other house cleaning chores. Sheila was responsible for Vern completing his undergraduate and graduate degrees at Memphis State University.

After Vern's betrayal as a husband Sheila continued to maintain her daily routine and care for her family. Sheila was a good mother, and her life was centered around the well being of her boys. She made sure they got their homework, cooked wholesome meals and disciplined as necessary.

She read bedtime stories and exposed them to travelling out of town by automobile, air and train. The boys completed Tae Kwon-Do classes, ran track, and both boys played Pee-Wee's football. She would sit in the heat, cold and rain during practice. The 2004 Pee-Wee team went undefeated and won the championship division one week after Sheila's death.

She did not get the opportunity to cheer them on. Both boys attended the banquet and received trophies. Sheila enjoyed sports from high school and played softball through 2001. Sheila took her boys to church, served as president of the PTA at Hallie (phonics spelling) Elementary, adoptive school coordinator at Cummings Elementary; several years a member of our church ministry, a member of the (inaudible) club, always helping and making a difference in someone's life.

Sheila was my daughter, my confidante, my friend and my prayer partner. We talked almost every day and often saw her during the week to make bank deposits. She was a beautiful thirty-two year old woman that had everything going

for her. She had a big heart, enjoyed improving the quality of life for her family, friends and patients.

She was strong mentally, physically and spiritually. She was intelligent, wore a big smile, and could be heard from quite a distance. It was very difficult to sitting through the court proceeding re-living Sheila's death, very painful observing exhibits, listening to the tapes, listening to the forensic evidence and other witnesses.

I fear the day her boys will have to learn the truth about their mother's death and how their father tried to present such heinous acts to paint an ugly image and destroy Sheila's reputation as a good mother and a good woman. Sheila loved her stepfather and would often ask for advice and guidance.

When she told us she had filed for her divorce in June of 2004 his advice to her was be careful and be prayerful. They often told jokes and short tales. Sheila's relationship with her father was unique. Their bond allowed them to have differences of opinion but knew where they stood with one another. She was very close to her grandparents who gave her solid advice and shared words of wisdom, which many she applied in her daily life working with patients and co-workers.

Positive attitudes and patience will go a long way. They depended on Sheila to get them to the grocery

store, doctor's appointments, checking their blood pressure, blood sugar, providing ongoing therapy and exercise for her grandmother who had both knees replaced.

Sheila's death has left a gigantic hole in their hearts, and to see and listen to the court hearings have added to their hurt and pain. Their recovery process is very slow. Her Uncle Ralph, mentally challenged, encouraged Sheila to become an occupational and physical therapist. She wanted to help people with disabilities. She was motivated to help those that had low or no self esteem and lacked the ability to help themselves.

Sheila was close to her brother. He was referred to as her big and only brother. Growing up he was a protective brother and she was a protective sister. Their birthdays were two years and one day apart, August 27th and August 28th. Usually they celebrated their birthdays together. They attended the same schools, elementary and high school, and they had so much in common and respected each other.

She protected and placed a shield around her brother from knowing what she was encountering in her marriage. Her big brother and sister-in-law have stepped in the role of guardianship to raise her boys with love, dignity and honor.

At the age of twenty Sheila helped care for her

adopted brother who was, at that time, two. She was a full time student at Shelby State College and managed to get him to and from day care and complete her studies. Not too many people would have done what she did to help the family bond and work as a family unit.

Again, she was always concerned and caring of others. Sheila was that type at an early age at Metropolitan Baptist Church and loved her church family. As a young child the church provided tutorial programs at the school, (inaudible), sports, bowling and other reading programs. She grew up in the Sunday schools, youth choirs and made Adults For Christ Choir and had a melodious voice.

She had a special relationship with the Lord and it was evidence because she carried herself in a manner that she knew -- that you knew she knew the Lord. During the month of September, 2004 she enrolled in a thirty-two week discipleship class at the church and was enjoying learning more about the Bible and the fellowship of her class participants.

Many patients of Sheila's attended her funeral on walkers, crutches, wheelchairs, and walking canes. They told us over and over again Sheila was responsible for their development and were going to miss her smile and small stature, because of her confidence in them to become mobile and self-sufficient.

She had a special patient almost like her own son. She cared for him from age two until age six. She provided therapy three times a week and sometimes beyond her scheduled hours. Her dream was to see him walk in her lifetime. Her patient made his first step a week before Sheila's death. They celebrated this milestone with tears and dancing.

Once a month I receive a telephone call from one of Sheila's patients in Mason, Tennessee. He shares his concern and how Sheila has faith in him to walk again after a serious auto accident that doctors stated he would not walk again. The odds were in his favor and he was blessed with a good therapist. He misses her very much and refers to her as his angel.

They have no idea how many people have been affected by Sheila's death, and most of all William and Miles. They are the real victims. They are confused and emotionally traumatized. Their mother has been snatched and they have missed the intimacy of them cuddling in her arms, longing to be held for comfort and encouragement, baptism, school trips, teenage years, sports, science projects, hobbies, girlfriends, prom dates, learning to drive, graduation from high school and college, marriage and their future families.

We will never know how many lives could have been saved or limbs restored to become flexible again, nor how many souls would have been saved during Sheila's lifetime. She

chose the right profession because her giving spirit and 1 asking for nothing in return. 2 Whatever the legal systems deems appropriate at 3 this time so shall it be done. 4 MS. CARNESALE: Thank you. Your Honor, the State 5 has no further proof. 6 MR. BAILEY: No questions. 7 THE COURT: Alright. You may step down. Thank 8 you. 9 (The witness was excused.) 10 Any further proof? 11 MS. CARNESALE: No, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Alright. Any proof, Mr. Bailey? 13 MR. BAILEY: Your Honor, in the interest of 14 judicial economy there were several letters that we had --15 that were filed actually with Judge Bennett prior to the 16 matter being indicted and sent to Your Honor's court and was 17 made a part of the technical record during our bond hearing. 18 I'd ask the Court to take judicial notice of 19 those, and if the Court chooses to read them into the record I 20 can, but Your Honor can take a look at that there were --21 THE COURT: You're right, let me make sure they're 22 in here. 23 If not there were two files and I MR. BAILEY: 24

want to make sure the Court knows that.

THE COURT: Yes, there are many letters in here that I recall from the bond hearing having been introduced.

MR. BAILEY: And I'll just state to the Court that since they are already a part of the record we'd ask the Court to take note of them.

THE COURT: I will.

MR. BAILEY: Those -- and just for the record it would be our position that those came from a cross section of the community, although it was during -- for purposes of bond they speak to the character and the work of Mr. Braswell in his local community.

Also I'll ask the Court since we did have a very extensive bond hearing, we put on quite a few witnesses that the Court has already heard from, his employer who's Ms. Ruby Payne, Doctor Ruby Payne, and several other people with regard to those same things, Mr. Braswell's character and his work in the community, we'd ask the Court to take note of that.

THE COURT: I will.

MR. BAILEY: With that said, as I stated earlier,
I have discussed with Mr. Braswell his right to be heard
during this hearing. Mr. Braswell, for the record, did
testify at trial and as a result he's going to waive his right
to be heard today.

THE COURT: Alright, and you have no additional proof?

MR. BAILEY: No additional proof in addition to that.

THE COURT: Alright. Ms. Carnesale, I'll hear any arguments you care to make.

CLOSING ARGUMENT OF STATE

BY MS. CARNESALE:

Your Honor, the Court heard all the testimony at trial and the State would submit that there was testimony regarding prior criminal behavior of the defendant, not limited to only to the two prior misdemeanor convictions that we do have on the Pre-Sentence Report.

Mr. Braswell, it was elicited at trial, both with Sheila Braswell, the victim, as well as other women had a violent history, he had choked both Ms. Braswell and Ms. Christy Woods in the past. He had assaulted the victim in the past and the State would ask that Your Honor take that into consideration as an enhancement factor based on the factor we've selected.

We understand that he's Range 1, and obviously the Court is aware that -- start a presumptive twenty year sentence we're asking that the Court move Mr. Braswell to the maximum twenty-five years. So we would certainly ask the

Court to find if the maximum is inappropriate that we enhance it beyond the presumptive twenty years based on his past criminal behavior as well as his prior convictions.

8 BY MR. BAILEY:

CLOSING ARGUMENT OF DEFENSE

I'm going to submit on the issue of mitigation, as
I've just stated on what's in the technical record, however,
with regards to enhancements I will bring to the Court's
attention that's why I was making my argument earlier about
some -- Gomez and the cases that I've already cited that in
order to utilize the proof that counsel has stated with regards
to acts against the witness, Ms. Christy Woods, and also
allegedly acts were put into the record with regards to prior
assault behavior against the victim in this matter I think that
requires a factual finding that Mr. Braswell's unreasonably
dangerous.

And I think that unless that was specifically put to the jury I disagree that that could be used as an enhancement factor based on the Gomez Decision, Gomez, a prendre and Blakley.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know where you're getting that but the excerpt from Gomez that you just read into the

record ten minutes ago specifically excludes these factors as requiring an a prendre or a Blakley type consideration.

Do you have Gomez there?

MR. BAILEY: I do. I'll pass it forward. I have it in full. In fact, let me just go ahead and pass forward the cases I've cited.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. BAILEY: In case Your Honor wants to take a look at those. Those are all the cases I cited.

(Complied.)

THE COURT: Well, in looking back through Gomez I don't see anything in here that supports your conviction -- your contention. I disagree with it. I think that the Supreme Court in this Opinion written by Chief Justice Drowota clearly distinguished the State law from the Federal law, and apparently in this case, once again, our State Attorney General's Office concedes error there only to be told by the Court that no, we're not going to accept your concession of error, you're wrong it wasn't error.

That's happened so many times, but notwithstanding the white flag waved by the State Attorney General's Office the Supreme Court concluded that our sentencing system does not violate the Blakley principles since our guidelines are advisory only. They do not set up a definite grid by which --- by which we must -- to which we must adhere when we sentence.

The discretionary, the advisory and beyond that the challenge really was to factual issues the defendant felt should have been resolved by a jury, not the prior convictions.

That wasn't even really at issue.

So for all those reasons I just don't think that
Blakley or any form of Blakley argument would apply in this
case, so I do think that as this -- as the enhancement factors
specifically set out in the wording of the Enhancement Factor
No. 2 the prior convictions as well as prior criminal behavior
would be applicable for my consideration in determining what
the appropriate sentence is.

The Enhancement Factor reads: The defendant has a previous history of criminal convictions, not felony convictions, not felony convictions within the past ten years, but criminal convictions or criminal behavior, not behavior within the past ten years or not behavior that results in a felony conviction, but criminal behavior in addition to those necessary to establish the appropriate range. And, of course, Range 1 no prior convictions are required, so any prior criminal behavior would apply.

MR. BAILEY: May I, just for the record, then make this argument with regards to the section of the Tennessee

Statute that -- that specifically says "Criminal Behavior."

I'll state to the Court that on behalf of Mr. Braswell I believe that that's unconstitutional, that it

24 violates his right to confrontation in light of the fact that if it's behavior that he's not been convicted of then he has 2 not had an opportunity to confront his accuser, to have a jury, 3 those due process rights both procedural and substantive. 4 whereby he can confront his accuser and have a jury decide his 5 innocence or guilt. 6 And for them to be used in a "sentencing scheme" 7 then it presumes guilt. When the law, I think, and the 8 Constitution, both Tennessee and the United States Constitution 9 presumes innocence. And so I'll just make that argument for 10 the record. 11 Also, let me just state this before I sit down. 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 MR. BAILEY: That -- and I'm not objecting to the 14 hearing today but, again, if I don't make the objection now 15 it's waived. We only received our Pre-Sentence Report today, 16 and although I did go through it with the defendant and I 17

didn't find anything in that period of time in going through that was objectionable.

THE COURT: Are you asking for a continuance to review it further? I'll be glad to grant that if you want that.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm not -- I understand that Your MR. BAILEY: Honor would, but I'm not. But I just want to make that -- make it known for my own protection too, okay?

Okay, alright. In --THE COURT: 1 MR. BAILEY: Also --2 Okay, go ahead. 3 THE COURT: MR. BAILEY: Also -- well, that'll be saved for a 4 different time. 5 THE COURT: Okay. And with regard to your argument 6 on criminal behavior would you consider his dishonest testimony 7 at the bond hearing to be under oath to be criminal behavior 8 that I could consider? MR. BAILEY: Yes. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 I think anything that the defendant MR. BAILEY: 12 says on the stand is something that Your Honor has a right to 13 consider well within all the principles of law that we've just 14 read. 15 16 17 18 SENTENCING 19 BY THE COURT: 20 Okay. Well, of course, Mr. Braswell, Alright. 21 unlike many defendants that come through court is a well 22 educated man that had a responsible job in the community. He, 23 in many ways, led a productive life. That was testimony that

came out during the bond hearing, during the trial, and is

24

borne out by the numerous letters that were submitted on his behalf. So I acknowledge all that, and that's on this side of the ledger.

However, on the other side of the ledger is a heinous offense as found by the jury. And, of course, we haven't had the motion for new trial yet, but I do think and I'll state now that I think that there was more than ample proof on which the jury could base its decision. So I think the jury has settled that issue and it was, indeed, a heinous offense that required considerable effort and -- well, considerable effort on your client's part to commit, and that was followed up by some very defective and questionable conduct on his part as borne out by the proof in the bond hearing and the trial.

And I think as well this isn't an enhancement factor but that just as listed statutorily but just as an observation there's been little of what I would consider to be genuine remorse expressed in this case. Notwithstanding his conduct on the witness stand during the trial I think if one were to listen to those tapes of those phone calls from the jail one would have to question the degree of remorse that your client exhibited with regard to this offense.

But with regard to the actual enhancement factor that was listed he clearly does have these two prior convictions. They're not recent but they are, nonetheless,

prior convictions, and very relevant convictions. The assault which began as an aggravated assault was pled out, apparently as a simple assault, is obviously very relevant to this type of an offense.

The theft of property involving the dishonesty that any theft was involved is very relevant in my opinion to his conduct after this offense was committed, and to his testimony, his dishonest testimony, from the witness stand during the bond hearing. All that sort of the prior conviction validates the sort of deceptive statements that were made during the bond hearing and at other times, and so I am concerned by the prior convictions and behavior that he exhibited since this case has been in this court.

And the law, of course, does require that the punishment in any offense be commensurate with the seriousness of the crime and the facts of the case. Therefore, considering all of the factors in this matter on both sides of the ledger, if you will, I am sentencing Mr. Braswell to serve a period of twenty-four years in the State Penitentiary.

* * * * *

MR. BAILEY: Your Honor, with regard to the motion for new trial I was going to -- we had talked about having that today. I called Ms. Carnesale a few days ago, and I'm

```
preparing for a trial that starts this Monday and it's just
1
   been impossible with all the proof that we had to do that, so
2
   I'll just reduce it to writing and have it another time if
3
   that's okay with the Court.
4
                            That's fine. February 10.
                THE COURT:
5
                MR. BAILEY: That's fine.
6
                THE COURT:
                             Sure.
7
8
9
10
         *** (11:45 A.M. - END OF REQUESTED PROCEEDINGS.) ***
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF TENNESSEE)
COUNTY OF SHELBY)



I, the undersigned, Bettye Ann Kee, Court Reporter for the Thirtieth Judicial District of the State of Tennessee, do hereby certify the foregoing to be a true, accurate and complete transcript, to the best of my knowledge, understanding and ability of all the evidence that was heard in this cause in Division V of the Criminal Court for Shelby County, Tennessee, before the Honorable Joseph B. Dailey, Presiding Judge, on the 6th day of January, 2006.

I do further certify that I am neither of kin, counsel nor interest to any party hereto.

Dated this 4th day of March, 2006.

20 | M

My Commission Expires:

21 December 13, 2008

Bettye Ann Ket NOTARY
Court Reporter PUBLIC